

**REMARKS**

The Office Action dated February 20, 2004, has been received and reviewed.

Claims 10-21, 23-37, and 59-119 were previously pending and under consideration in the above-referenced application.

Claims 10-21, 23, 24, and 84-119 have been allowed. The Office has also indicated that claims 29, 30, 32-37, 60-67, 70-73, 75-79, 82, and 83 recite allowable subject matter.

Claims 25-28, 31, 59, 68, 69, 74, 80, and 81 stand rejected.

Of these, claim 69 has been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer.

Reconsideration of the above-referenced application is respectfully requested.

**Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement**

Please note that a Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement was filed in the above-referenced application on September 2, 2003, but that the undersigned attorney has not yet received any indication that the references cited in the Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement have been considered in the above-referenced application. It is respectfully requested that the references cited in the Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement of September 2, 2003, be considered and made of record in the above-referenced application and that an initialed copy of the Form PTO/SB/08A that accompanied that Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement be returned to the undersigned attorney as evidence of such consideration.

**Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)**

Claims 25-28, 31, 59, 68, 69, 74, 80, and 81 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) for reciting subject matter which is allegedly anticipated by the disclosure of U.S. Patent 6,284,982 to Kusner et al. (hereinafter "Kusner").

A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single reference which qualifies as prior art under 35 U.S.C. § 102. *Verdegaal Brothers v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053

(Fed. Cir. 1987). The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the claim. *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

Kusner describes a method for modifying a circuit board to include resistor elements. Such modification is effected by use of a laminating component 10, which includes a polymeric film 12 that carries the resistor 18 on one surface and a metallic film 16 on the opposite surface. The laminating component 10 is adhesively secured (with adhesive 42) to the surface of a circuit board (*i.e.*, “inner laminate 40”). Thereafter, conductive traces 52, 54, 56, 58 and corresponding contacts are defined from the metallic film 16. Through holes 62 are then formed through ends of the conductive traces 52, 54, 56, 58 and the polymeric film 12 to the expose portions of the resistors 18. The through holes are plated or may otherwise be filled with conductive material to electrically connect the conductive traces 52, 54, 56, 58 to the resistors 18.

Independent claim 25 is directed to a carrier for at least one semiconductor device. The carrier of independent claim 25 includes a substrate and a polymeric film that is separate from the substrate. The substrate carries at least one conductive trace. The polymeric film carries at least one additional conductive trace. As amended and presented herein, independent claim 25 recites that the at least one additional conductive trace carried by the polymeric film is “configured to provide a more direct electrical route from a location of the substrate adjacent to a first edge of the routing element to a location of the substrate adjacent to a second edge of the routing element than could be provided by conductive traces carried by the substrate.”

Independent claims 59 and 80 are drawn to semiconductor device assemblies. The semiconductor device assembly of each of independent claims 59 and 80 includes a substrate, a routing element, and at least one semiconductor device. The substrate carries a first plurality of conductive traces. The routing element carries a second plurality of conductive traces. Independent claims 59 and 80, as amended and presented herein, recites that each of the second plurality of conductive traces is “configured to provide a more direct electrical route from a location of the substrate adjacent to a first edge of the routing element to a location of the substrate adjacent to a second edge of the routing element than could be provided by conductive traces carried by the substrate . . .”

Kusner lacks any express description that a conductive path formed by the conductive traces 52 and 54 or 56 and 58, metallization within two through holes 62, and a resistor 18 is “configured to provide a more direct electrical route from a location of the [inner laminate 40] adjacent to a first edge of the [laminating component 10] to a location of the [inner laminate 40] adjacent to the second edge of the [laminating component 10] than could be provided by conductive traces carried by the [inner laminate 40].”

As the laminating component 10 of Kusner is used to increase electrical resistance and includes a conductive path, formed by conductive traces 52 and 54 or 56 and 58, metallization within two through holes 62 that pass through the thickness of the polymeric film 12 (or, optionally, through adhesive 42), and the resistor 18, that takes a nonlinear path, it is evident that the conductive elements of the laminating component 10 need not provide the shortest possible pathway between two points (*e.g.*, two edges of the laminating component 10). Therefore, it is also respectfully submitted that Kusner does not inherently describe that such a conductive path is “configured to provide a more direct electrical route from a location of the [inner laminate 40] adjacent to a first edge of the [laminating component 10] to a location of the [inner laminate 40] adjacent to the second edge of the [laminating component 10] than could be provided by conductive traces carried by the [inner laminate 40].”

For these reasons, Kusner does not anticipate each and every element of any of amended independent claims 25, 59, and 80. Therefore, under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), each of these claims is directed to subject matter which is allowable over that described in Kusner.

Claims 26-28 and 31 are each allowable, among other reasons, for depending either directly or indirectly from claim 25, which is allowable.

Claim 68 is allowable, among other reasons, for depending directly from claim 59, which is allowable.

Claim 69 has been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer, rendering the rejection thereof moot.

Claim 81, as amended and presented herein, is allowable, among other reasons, for depending directly from claim 80, which is allowable. Amended claim 81 is further allowable

since Kusner lacks any express or inherent description of an assembly that includes a routing element with conductive traces that extend at least partially over a semiconductor device.

Independent claim 74, as amended and presented herein, recites a semiconductor device assembly that includes a substrate, a routing element, and a plurality of semiconductor devices. At least two of the semiconductor devices are located adjacent to different edges of the routing element.

Kusner neither expressly nor inherently describes, or anticipates, an assembly with a semiconductor devices that are located adjacent to different edges of the laminating component 10 disclosed therein, as would be required to anticipate the subject matter to which amended independent claim 74 is directed..

It is, therefore, respectfully submitted that, under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), amended independent claim 74, is directed to subject matter which is allowable over that disclosed in Kusner.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully requested that the 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) rejections of claims 25-28, 31, 59, 68, 69, 74, 80, and 81 be withdrawn.

#### **Additional Claim Amendments**

In addition to the claim amendments that have been noted above, the terms “side” and “sides” have been replaced with the more accurate terms “surface” and “surfaces,” respectively. As these revisions merely comprise substitution of terms with equivalent terms, and have not been made in response to any objection to or rejection of the claims, they do not narrow the scope of any of the claims of the above-referenced application.

#### **Allowable Subject Matter**

The indication that claims 29, 30, 32-37, 60-67, 70-73, 75-79, 82, and 83 recite allowable subject matter is noted with appreciation. None of these claims has been amended to

independent form because it is believed that the independent claims from which they depend are allowable for at least the reasons set forth herein.

### CONCLUSION

It is respectfully submitted that each of claims 10-21, 23-37, 59-68, and 70-119 is allowable. An early notice of the allowability of each of these claims is respectfully solicited, as is an indication that the above-referenced application has been passed for issuance. If any issues preventing allowance of the above-referenced application remain which might be resolved by way of a telephone conference, the Office is kindly invited to contact the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,



Brick G. Power  
Registration No. 38,581  
Attorney for Applicants  
TRASKBRITT, PC  
P.O. Box 2550  
Salt Lake City, Utah 84110-2550  
Telephone: 801-532-1922

Date: May 20, 2004

BGP/nj:rmh  
Document in ProLaw